

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on July 5, 2006 and is being filed pursuant to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) as provided under 37 CFR 1.114. At the time the Examiner mailed the Final Office Action claims 1 - 14 and 16-45 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicant has: 1) amended claims 1, 2, 5, 13, 14, 16, 21, 24 and 27; 2) canceled claims 20, 28 through 45; and, 3) added new claims 46 through 59. As such claims 1-14, 16-19, 21-27 and 46-59 remain pending. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all pending claims.

After a conversation with the Examiner held on September 5, 2006 in which the Applicant merely expressed a desire to modify the claims as provided herein for purposes of more clearly stating that which the Applicant has repeatedly maintained in prior responses is patentable, and in which the Examiner expressed that a new search would be warranted, the Applicant herewith submits another response pursuant to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) as provided under 37 CFR 1.114.

The Applicant has also canceled claims 28 through 45 to further lighten the burden on the Examiner in the hopes that the application can finally proceed to issuance. New claims 46 through 59 merely recite claims 1 through 14 in Beauregard form.

As stated in prior office actions, the Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art cited by the Examiner fails to disclose teach or suggest a method that involves:

a) generating, at a client, a request for an action to be performed by a server to a data object, said data object being maintained by said server, said server to generate a response for said client as a consequence of performing said action;

b) sending a request message from said client to said server over a network, said response being divide-able into a plurality of smaller response portions, wherein said request message comprises a request for a first response portion of said plurality of smaller response portions and wherein said request message further comprises:

1) a description of said action;

2) a description of said data object;

3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of said first response portion;

c) maintaining at said client an understanding of how much of said first response portion has been sent by said server and received from said network by said client; and

d) issuing another request message from said client to said server for another response portion of said plurality of smaller response portions that has not been received at said client.

Specifically, neither the Miller, Maddalozzo nor Treadwell references together or separately disclose a request message that: 1) effectively asks for a smaller portion

of a complete response; and, 2) includes a limit that defines the maximum size of the smaller portion.

Because these novel and non-obvious features are recited in each of independent claims 1, 16 and 46, the Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests their allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons provided above, applicant respectfully submits that the current set of claims are allowable. If the Examiner believes an additional telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Robert B. O'Rourke at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Date: 10/3/06

Robert B. O'Rourke
Reg. No. 46,972

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300